



PATENT
Attorney Docket No.: 11233.00
Express Mail Label No.: EV 423772074 US

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re: Application of

Inventor: Dario Guidetti

Confirmation No.: 8510

Application No.: 10/004,903

Examiner: Janice Lee Krizek

Filed: November 2, 2001

Group Art Unit: 3652

Title: PROCESS AND DEVICE FOR
CONVEYING PRODUCTS, FOR
INSTANCE FOR AUTOMATIC
PACKAGING INSTALLATIONS

MAIL STOP AMENDMENT
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING BY EXPRESS MAIL

Sir:

The undersigned hereby certifies that the following documents:

1. Combined Amendment & Petition for Extension of Time (2 pages);
2. Amendment and Response in Reply to Office Communication (15 pages);
3. Certificate of Mailing by Express Mail (1 page); and
4. Return Card

relating to the above application, were deposited as "Express Mail" under 37 CFR § 1.10, Mailing Label No. EV 423772074 US, with the United States Postal Service addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on July 7, 2004.



Mailer's Signature
Print Name: Jane M. Lalis | | EV423772074US

Dorsey & Whitney LLP

Tel: 303-629-3400
Fax: 303-629-3450



Appl. No. 10/004,903
Amdt. dated: January 7, 2004
Reply to Office action of October 7, 2003
Attorney Docket No. 11233.00
Express Mail No. EV 423 772 074 US

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re: Application of

Inventor: Dario Guidetti

Confirmation No.: 8510

Application No.: 10/004,903

Examiner: Janice Lee Krizek

Filed: November 2, 2001

Group Art Unit: 3652

Title: PROCESS AND DEVICE FOR
CONVEYING PRODUCTS, FOR
INSTANCE FOR AUTOMATIC
PACKAGING INSTALLATIONS

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE IN REPLY TO OFFICE COMMUNICATION

Sir:

On October 7, 2003, the Office issued an Office action in the above-referenced case. The Assignee replied on January 7, 2004. The Office issued a communication on June 7, 2004, indicating the Assignee's 7 January reply was not fully responsive, insofar as it failed to indicate how newly-presented claims 34 and 38 were patentably distinct from the prior art of record. In response to this communication, the Assignee submits the current paper. This Amendment and Response reiterates the remarks and amendments set forth in the 7 January paper, in addition to discussing the patentability of claims 34 and 38. Accordingly, the status identifiers for the claims remain the same as those set forth in the non-entered 7 January paper.

Amendments to the Claims are reflected in the listing of claims which begins on page 2 of this paper.

Remarks begin on page 12 of this paper.